

REMARKS

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claim rejections set forth in the Office communication dated August 10, 2007.

Summary

Claim 8 is currently amended.

Claim 23 is cancelled.

Claims 1 – 2, 4 – 8, 15 – 22, and 24 – 29 are currently pending.

Summary of Substance of Interview

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephonic interview with Applicant's Agent, Jay Knobloch, on 26 October 2007.

The status of the substitute specification was discussed during the telephonic interview. The substitute specification was filed on August 1, 2007. The Examiner did not previously consider the substitute specification because it was incorrectly labeled in the Image File Wrapper on Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR). During the telephonic interview, the Applicant's Agent inquired about the incorrect label. At the time of the telephonic interview, the substitute specification was labeled "Specification – Amendment Not Entered." The Examiner agreed to change the label and consider the substitute specification because the Examiner believed that the incorrect label was due to an inadvertent error by the PTO at the time of filing.

The claim rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph were also discussed during the telephonic interview. After considering FIG 1 and FIG 1', the Examiner generally agreed that claim 1 was not indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant agreed to remind the Examiner that in Fig. 1, the clamping devices may include clamping devices 5a – 5f (See, e.g., paragraph [0024] of the substitute specification – clean version). In light of the discussion, the Examiner agreed that "the clamping device receives the connecting element" of claim 1 is not indefinite. Therefore, claim 1 is not indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated that claims 23 – 25 and 27 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (Office Action dated August 10, 2007; page 7).

The Examiner also indicated that claims 2, 4 – 5, and 20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (Office Action dated August 10, 2007; page 7).

Drawings

The drawings were objected to pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). The Examiner stated that “[t]he drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “robots” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s)” (Office Action dated August 10, 2007; page 2).

Applicant respectfully submits that the “robots” are shown in the drawings. Paragraph [0033] of the substitute specification recites, *inter alia*, “the elements 3a and 3b are securing robots.” The elements 3a and 3b are at least shown in FIG. 1'. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

Specification

The Examiner objected to the Specification because of the following informality: “There are no headings per U.S. practice” (Office Action dated August 10, 2007; page 3).

As discussed during the telephonic interview, the substitute specification was not previously considered because it was incorrectly labeled in PAIR. The Examiner agreed to consider the substitute specification filed on August 1, 2006. The substitute specification includes headings. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the Specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1 – 2, 4 – 7, 15 – 17, and 18 – 22 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In regards to claim 1, the Examiner inquired “how can the clamping device receive the connecting element, which is a rigid conductor, being a screw” (Office Action dated August 10, 2007; page 3).

In regard to claim 1 – 2, 4 – 5, and 20, as discussed during the telephonic interview, the clamping devices may include clamping devices 5a – 5f (See, e.g., paragraph [0024] of the substitute specification – clean version). The Examiner agreed that “the clamping device receives the connecting element” of claim 1 is not indefinite. Therefore, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the claim rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In regard to claims 15 – 17, the Examiner stated: “Nothing is said about any robot in the specification or shown in the drawings. Applicant respectfully disagrees. At least paragraphs [0012] and [0033] discuss robots. As discussed above, the drawings show robots. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the claim rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In regard to claim 18, the Examiner stated: “Claim 18 can not be examined because of the problems with claim 10” (Office Action dated August 10, 2007; page 4). Claim 10 was cancelled in the preliminary amendment dated August 1, 2006. The Examiner did not discuss or reject claim 10 in the current Office action. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the claim rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 6 – 7, and 19 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Skirpan. Claims 8, 26 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being

anticipated by Skirpan. Claims 21 – 22 and 28 – 29 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skirpan.

Claim 1 recites the clamping device receives the connecting element.

Skirpan fails to disclose the clamping device receives the connecting element. The Examiner cites the screw 277 as the connecting element and lug 301 as the clamping device. As illustrated in FIG. 11, “[t]he U-shaped opening 302 of each lug 301 is directly received over a respective one of the buses 110, 156 or ground connector 160” (col. 13, line 66 – col. 14, line 14). The screw 277 secures the buses 110, 156, and ground connector 160 to a cable guide 277 extending through the spacer 278 and guide 275. The lug 301 does not receive the screw 277. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Skirpan.

Dependent claims 6 – 7, 19, and 21 – 22 depend from allowable claim 1, so are allowable for at least this reason. Further limitations of the dependent claims are allowable over the cited references. For example, claim 6 recites the clamping device is a screw terminal or a spring clip. The Examiner cites lug 301 as the clamping device. The lug 301 does not have a screw terminal or a spring clip. Instead, the lug 301 has a u-shaped opening 302 that receives a respective one of the buses 110, 156, or ground connector 160 (col. 13, lines 66 – 68). In another example, claim 19 recites the screw has a head which is electrically coupled with the contact on the first side of the flat block of components. The Examiner cites the screw 277 as the screw. Skirpan does not teach that the screw 277 is electrically coupled with a contact on the buses 110, 156 or ground connector 160.


Amended claim 8 incorporates the allowable feature of claim 23. Therefore, claim 8 is allowable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons that claim 23 is allowable over the cited reference. Dependent claims 16 – 17, 26, and 28 – 29 depend from allowable claim 8, so are allowable for at least this reason.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons presented above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jay Q. Knobloch", written over a horizontal line.

Jay Q. Knobloch
Reg. No. 97,347
Agent for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200